

REMARKS

The last Office Action has been carefully considered.

It is noted that in the Examiner's opinion the application contained claims directed to patentably distinct features of Figures 1, 4, 5, 6, 7. The Examiner required to elect a single disclosed species. With the present Amendment applicants first of all amended claim 1 to more clearly define the present invention. In particular claim 1 now specifically defines that driven shaft 28 is directly supported against the supporting element 38.

These new features of the present invention are disclosed for example in the paragraph bridging pages 4 and 5 of the specification.

Turning now to the Examiner's requirement to elect a single disclosed species, it is respectfully submitted that the new feature of the present invention, in particular the direct axial support of the driven wheel 28 against the supporting element 38 is provided in the embodiments of the invention shown in Figures 4, 5, and 6 which are specified by the Examiner as species B, C, D. These three embodiments differ however in that the supporting element 38 in Figure 6 is formed of one piece with the housing,

the supporting element 38 in Figure 5 is formed as a single-piece insert, and the supporting element in Figure 4 is formed as a multi-piece insert which is arranged on the transmission housing. The different variations of the supporting element 38 have, however, no influence on the operational principle and the force distribution, since in each case the end face 66 of the driven shaft 38 abuts directly against the end face of the supporting element 38 with the reduced inner diameter 64. Thereby the crush forces are transmitted from the driven shaft 28 also to the transmission housing 15 and the seat thereby is held more reliable in its nominal position. Whether the supporting element 38 is formed of one piece with the housing or as a single-space or a multi-part insert is exclusively the issue of the manufacturing and mounting technique. Therefore, these different embodiments are united by a single inventive idea.

It is therefore believed that Figures 4, 5, and 6 can be elected for further prosecution. However to be responsive the applicants provisionally elect the species of Figure 6 for further prosecution. Claims 1, 3-5, 9 and 11 are readable on the elected species.

It is additionally respectfully directed to include also the claims defining the embodiment of Figures 5 and 4. In particular, claim 2, is specific

to the embodiment of Figure 5 and claim 10 is specific to the embodiment of Figure 4.

Consideration of the present application on the merits and its allowance is most respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner require or consider it advisable that the specification, claims and/or drawings be further amended or corrected in formal respects in order to place this case in condition for final allowance, then it is respectfully requested that such amendments or corrections be carried out by Examiner's Amendment, and the case be passed to issue. Alternatively, should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance, he is invited to telephone the undersigned (at 631-549-4700).

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Striker  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 27233